

A bottom-up analysis of horizontal symmetry

C.S. Lam

Department of Physics, McGill University

Montreal, Q.C., Canada H3A 2T8

and

Department of Physics and Astronomy,

University of British Columbia,

Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1Z1

Email: Lam@physics.mcgill.ca

Abstract

The group-theoretical method used to derive horizontal symmetry from neutrino mixing is reviewed and expanded. Some misunderstanding in the literature regarding the result is clarified. The method used previously to find vacuum alignments of S_4 is applied to compute those of A_4 and S_3 . A study of effective theories based on these three groups shows that in each case there are just enough free parameters to fit all the masses and the remaining mixing parameters. This places constraint on dynamical models because effective theories are just dynamical models with the right-handed fermions integrated out. How quarks may fit into this scheme is briefly discussed.

I. INTRODUCTION

The usual method to model a mass matrix proceeds from the top down. First, a horizontal symmetry group $\mathcal{G}$ is picked, an irreducible representation (IR) is assigned to each left-handed (LH) and each right-handed (RH) fermion in the theory, and a number of Higgs-like scalar bosons is created to couple invariantly to the fermions. Then, Higgs expectation values are introduced to break the symmetry, from which mass matrices are computed. The mass matrices so obtained depend on the Yukawa couplings, the mass parameters, and the Higgs expectation values. These parameters are chosen to fit the observed fermion masses, the mixing angles, and the phases. Such a construction is often applied to the leptons alone, but sometimes it is also carried out in grand unified theories containing both leptons and quarks. In the latter case frequently only approximate fits are obtained.

A model containing an equal or a larger number of tunable parameters than available experimental quantities can be expected to fit all the data, even without a horizontal symmetry. Thus the introduction of a horizontal symmetry is justified only when it leads to unambiguous predictions to allow a smaller number of parameters to be used to fit the data. Many existing models do have fewer parameters, some much fewer, but if they fit the experimental quantities only approximately, then it is unclear what and where exactly are the savings coming from the symmetry assumption.

In this article we review and expand on a complementary approach [1], *using only left-handed fermions and start from the bottom up*. In this approach, symmetry is directly connected to mixing, so the gain from symmetry is clear. The simplification of using only LH fermions comes about because low energy data such as masses and mixing parameters can all be determined from the effective mass matrices connecting only LH fermions.

The simplification also brings about its limitation, in that without the RH fermions local dynamical theories cannot be constructed. In other words, although the connection between mixing and the LH effective theory is straight forward and unique, the next step of constructing a dynamical model is not. Nevertheless, this analysis tells us what would happen to every dynamical model after its RH components are integrated out. To the extent that low energy data can all be determined from the LH effective theories, they already carry most of the information reachable by present-day experiments.

Sec. 2 contains a review of the general method and the previous results. This method

is used to compute the vacuum alignments of A_4 and S_3 in Sec. 3. The results are listed in Table 1, together with the alignments of S_4 previously obtained and the IR from which these vacuum alignments are calculated.

A detailed discussion of the LH effective theories for these groups is carried out in Sec. 4. The number of independent parameters is determined in each case, with the result tabulated in Table 2. It turns out that in all the cases considered, there are always just enough parameters to fit all the masses and the undetermined mixing parameters.

In principle, this bottom-up group-theoretical approach can be applied to the quark sector as well, but the symmetry so obtained is very different from the symmetry in the lepton sector, because their mixing matrices are vastly different. For reasons already discussed [1], we prefer to determine the horizontal symmetry from the lepton sector. The question of how quarks can fit into this scheme will be briefly discussed in Sec. 5.

The remainder of this section is devoted to addressing some confusions found in the literature regarding our previous results [1], summarized below.

1. If the neutrino mixing matrix is tri-bimaximal (TBM) [2], then the minimal left-handed (LH) symmetry group ¹ in the lepton sector is S_4 ; ‘minimal’ means that every other LH symmetry group contains S_4 as a subgroup.
2. If only trimaximal mixing taken from the second column of the TBM is assumed in the mixing, then the smallest LH symmetry group is A_4 . It is not known whether this group is minimal or not.
3. If only bimaximal mixing taken from the third column of the TBM is assumed, then the smallest LH symmetry group is S_3 . It is not known whether this group is minimal or not.
4. If only the first column of the TBM is assumed, then the minimal symmetry group is again S_4 . In principle the mixing matrix so obtained need not be TBM, because

¹ This is the horizontal symmetry group for an effective theory in which only LH fermions and composite Higgs appear. Such an effective theory is obtained from a dynamical model by integrating out its RH fermions. The resulting effective Hamiltonian is generally non-local, but that does not matter because we are only interested in its horizontal-symmetry structure. This group was referred to as the natural symmetry group in [1], but since there is objection to that name [4], I will use a more descriptive terminology here and call it the LH symmetry group.

neither trimaximal mixing nor bimaximal mixing is explicitly assumed.

Starting from a symmetry group $\mathcal{G}$ so derived, one can compute the Higgs alignment needed to regain the original mixing. This has been carried out in S_4 [1], and it will also be done for A_4 and S_3 in Sec. 3.

Obviously, additional soft breaking or some other vacuum alignment can be imposed on $\mathcal{G}$ so that the original mixing input is not recovered. Conversely, one may fit all the experimental data including mixing without even any symmetry as long as a sufficient number of parameters are provided. The present approach simply tells us that certain predictions on mixing can be obtained if an appropriate LH group $\mathcal{G}$ and the appropriate vacuum alignments are used, and that this correspondence is one to one.

If $\mathcal{G}$ is the LH symmetry group, one can always construct a local dynamical model with $\mathcal{G}$ as the dynamical symmetry, giving rise to the same prediction on mixing, *but there is no claim to the converse*. In other words, it is conceivable that a dynamical model with some other symmetry group can lead to a LH effective theory with an enhanced LH symmetry group $\mathcal{G}$. With these remarks, one finds that the two ‘counter examples’ in [3] really do not contradict the results cited in 1 to 4 above.

II. THE CONNECTION BETWEEN MIXING AND THE HORIZONTAL GROUP

In this section we review the relation between the mixing matrix and the minimal LH symmetry group $\mathcal{G}$ [1]. The relation comes from the recognition that $\mathcal{G}$ is the minimal group generated by a set of *residual symmetry operators* that can be computed from the mixing matrix. Conversely, given $\mathcal{G}$, the mixing matrix can be retrieved if certain computable vacuum alignments (direction of Higgs expectation values) are used. The rest of this section contains a sketch of the details to establish terminologies and notations. It also explains how the familiar groups S_4 , A_4 , and S_3 for leptons arise in this context.

Let M_i ($i = u, d, e, \nu$) be the Dirac mass matrices for the up-quarks, down-quarks, charged-leptons, and neutrinos respectively, connecting LH to RH fermions, and M_N be the Majorana mass matrix for the heavy (‘right-handed’) neutrinos. Since we only deal with LH fermions, the mass matrices we need to consider are the LH to LH effective mass matrices $\bar{M}_i$, defined by $\bar{M}_i = M_i M_i^\dagger$ ($i = u, d, e$) and $\bar{M}_\nu = M_\nu M_N^{-1} M_\nu^T$. Let U_i ($i = u, d, e, \nu$) be the unitary matrices that render $U_i^\dagger \bar{M}_i U_i$ ($i = u, d, e$) and $U_\nu^T \bar{M}_\nu U_\nu$ diagonal. Then the mixing

matrix is $U_{CKM} = U_u^\dagger U_d$ for the quarks and $U_{PMNS} = U_e^\dagger U_\nu$ for the leptons. In particular, in the basis where $\bar{M}_d$ and $\bar{M}_e$ are diagonal, which we shall adopt from now on, $U_{CKM}^\dagger = U_u$ and $U_{PMNS} = U_\nu$. In most of the following we deal explicitly with the lepton sector, but the quark sector can be treated analogously.

Let F and G be respectively unitary symmetry operators for charged leptons and neutrinos, meaning that $F^\dagger \bar{M}_e F = \bar{M}_e$ and $G^T \bar{M}_\nu G = \bar{M}_\nu$. Then it follows that F and $\bar{M}_e$ have common eigenvectors, given by the columns of $U_e = \mathbf{1}$, and G and $\bar{M}_\nu$ have common (pseudo-)eigenvectors, given by the columns of $U_\nu = U_{PMNS}$. Being unitary, the eigenvalues of both F and G are unimodular, but on account of the Majorana character of the neutrinos, the eigenvalues of G must also be real, and by convention one of them is chosen to be $+1$ and two of them chosen to be -1 . With this convention, three symmetry operators G_a ($a = 1, 2, 3$) can be constructed for each mixing matrix U_ν , in which the eigenvector with $+1$ eigenvalue is taken from the a th column of U_ν . These operators satisfy $G_a^2 = 1$ and $G_a G_b = G_c$ if a, b, c are different, so only two of the three are independent. In contrast, F remains uncertain because it may have arbitrary eigenvalues, as long as they are unimodular.

Abstractly, the group generated by G_a is always $Z_2 \times Z_2$, whatever the mixing matrix is, and the group generated by F is always a subgroup of $U(1)$. Obvious that information is useless [1, 3] if we do not know how this subgroup in the charged-lepton sector is intertwined with the group $Z_2 \times Z_2$ in the neutrino sector. To be useful we need the detailed form of F and G_a determined from the mixing matrix to establish the horizontal LH symmetry group $\mathcal{G}$.

The symmetry operators F and G shall be referred to as *residual symmetry operators*, and we will use the notation $\mathcal{R} = (F, G)$ to denote them. We know that $F \neq G$ or else there would be no mixing. The minimal horizontal LH symmetry group $\mathcal{G}$ is then the minimal group generated by the operators F and G : $\mathcal{G} = \{F, G\}$.

In principle there could be many residual operators of type F , but to find minimal groups we may confine to only one of them. If we demand $\mathcal{G}$ to be a finite group, we must have $F^n = 1$ for some finite n . If we want to be able to reconstruct the mixing matrix from the residual symmetry operators, we must require F to be non-degenerate, in the sense that no two eigenvalues are identical, hence $n \geq 3$. Even with these restrictions we still have an infinite choice of F , by picking any $n \geq 3$, any three distinct n th root of unity as its eigenvalues, and one of the $3! = 6$ permuted arrangements of eigenvalues in the matrix F .

Correspondingly, there may be many minimal LH symmetry groups $\mathcal{G}$.

We shall return to the choice of F after discussing the experimental implications on G_a . In the neutrino sector, we shall first assume $U_{PMNS} = U_\nu$ to be of the tri-bimaximal (TBM) form

$$U_\nu = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & \sqrt{2} & 0 \\ -1 & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{3} \\ -1 & \sqrt{2} & -\sqrt{3} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

which when compared with experimental data is accurate to within one standard deviation. Using the recipe explained above, we can compute from that the three residual symmetry operators to be

$$G_1 = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -2 & -2 \\ -2 & -2 & 1 \\ -2 & 1 & -2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad G_2 = -\frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -2 & -2 \\ -2 & 1 & -2 \\ -2 & -2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad G_3 = - \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

Now return to the choice of F . For $n = 3$, the three distinct eigenvalues are the cubic roots of identity, $1, \omega = e^{2\pi i/3}$, and ω^2 . There are six distinct F 's corresponding to the $3!$ permutations, but only two of them generate distinct groups $\mathcal{G}$. The one generated by $F_1 = \text{diag}(1, \omega, \omega^2)$ is $\mathcal{G} = \{F_1, G_2, G_3\} = S_4$, the permutation group of four objects, and the one generated by $F_2 = \text{diag}(\omega, 1, \omega^2)$ is $\mathcal{G} = \{F_2, G_2, G_3\} = 3S_4$, consisting of $S_4, \omega S_4$, and $\omega^2 S_4$. It contains S_4 as a subgroup. One representation of F_1, G_1, G_2, G_3 in S_4 is $F_1 = (123)$, $G_1 = (14)$, $G_2 = (14)(23)$, $G_3 = (23)$. This representation will be useful in seeing how subgroups of S_4 are generated.

For any choice of F with $n > 3$, it can be shown that if $\mathcal{G} = \{F, G_2, G_3\}$ is a finite group, then it always contains S_4 as a subgroup. Hence S_4 is the minimal symmetry group for TBM. For example, $PSL_2(7) = \Sigma(168)$ is one of these groups [5] containing S_4 as a subgroup.

The tri-bimaximal matrix implies a vanishing reactor angle θ_{13} , with an ineffective CP phase. Since the experimental error of this angle is still large, it is reasonable not to be so committed at the present, which means that the bimaximal character appeared in the third column of (1) should be abandoned. We may still assume the second column (trimaximal mixing) of (1) to be valid [6], in which case the first and third columns of U_ν are parameterized by two real parameters. With that, the only known symmetry operator in the neutrino sector is G_2 , and the horizontal group generated by $\{F_1, G_2\}$ can be seen to be $\mathcal{G} = A_4$,

the subgroup of S_4 with even permutations. If the two parameters in the mixing matrix are adjusted so that $\theta_{13} = 0$, then an accidental symmetry exists to enlarge the symmetry from A_4 to S_4 . The LH symmetry group generated by other F 's and G_2 are not presently known.

Similarly, if we retain the first column of (1), then $\mathcal{G} = \{F_1, G_1\} = S_4$, but in this case the reactor angle does not necessarily vanish. This illustrates the fact the symmetry alone cannot determine the mixing matrix. What is needed in addition is the alignment of the composite Higgs, to be discussed in the next section.

If for some reason we only want to retain the third column of (1), namely, the bimaximal mixing, then it is well known that the reactor angle vanishes and the atmospheric angle is maximal. In that case the solar angle is a parameter, and the symmetry group is $\mathcal{G} = \{F_1, G_3\} = S_3$.

III. VACUUM ALIGNMENT

Given a LH symmetry group $\mathcal{G}$, the original mixing can be recovered by keeping the residual symmetry $\mathcal{R}$ intact in the spontaneous breaking of $\mathcal{G}$. This in turn can be achieved by having the correct vacuum alignments computed as follows.

We start with an effective Hamiltonian $\bar{H}$, constructed from LH fermions and composite Higgs fields. It can be thought of as the result of a dynamical Hamiltonian H with the RH fermions integrated out. The Higgs field in $\bar{H}$ are often bilinear in the Higgs fields in H , hence the name ‘composite’. $\bar{H}$ may not be local, but it is invariant under the LH symmetry group $\mathcal{G}$. We retain in $\bar{H}$ only the Yukawa terms, because only those contribute to the mass matrices. Mass terms may be present but they are special cases of Yukawa terms coupled to a singlet Higgs possessing non-zero expectation values, so they will not be considered separately. The composite Higgs coupled to the LH charged leptons will be denoted by Φ , and those coupled to the LH neutrinos will be denoted by Ψ . See Sec. 4 for details.

The condition for $\mathcal{R} = (F, G)$ to remain a symmetry of $\bar{H}$ after the Higgs acquire their expectation values is

$$\begin{aligned} F^{(A)} \langle \Phi^{(A)} \rangle &= \langle \Phi^{(A)} \rangle, \\ G^{(A)} \langle \Psi^{(A)} \rangle &= \langle \Psi^{(A)} \rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

for every residual symmetry operator G and for every IR (A) of the group $\mathcal{G}$. $F^{(A)}$ and $G^{(A)}$

are the IRs of F and G .

For $\mathcal{G} = \{F_1, G_2, G_3\} = S_4$, these alignments have been computed, and the result is listed in Table 1. The other three cases in Table 1 are computed similarly using (3) and the IRs of $F^{(A)}$ and $G^{(A)}$, also listed in Table 1. Note that the 3-dimensional representation of S_3 is always reducible. In that table, $\mathcal{G} = \{F_1, G_1\} = S_4$ is denoted $\bar{S}_4$, to distinguish it from $\mathcal{G} = \{F_1, G_2, G_3\}$ which is denoted as S_4 . It has a different residual symmetry $\mathcal{R}$, so its Higgs alignments are not the same as S_4 .

In Table 1, the IRs are listed in the second row, with numerals indicating the dimension of the representation, and $-$ indicating the absence of a particular IR in that group. For easiness of printing, column vectors are written as row vectors in the table, and $(1, 1, 1)_\perp$ is any vector orthogonal to $(1, 1, 1)$. The overall normalization of each vacuum alignment is arbitrary because (3) is linear. ‘dr’ in the first row stands for ‘defining representation’, which is the representation the LH fermions belong to. I apologize for the convention adopted here in which the defining representation of S_4 , for which $\det(G_i) = +1$, is called $\mathbf{3}'$ rather than $\mathbf{3}$. The other symbols are, $\omega = e^{2\pi i/3}$, σ_1 is the Pauli matrix $[[0, 1], [1, 0]]$, and g_a are the G_a defined in eq. (2), namely, $g_1 = [[1, -2, -2], [-2, -2, 1], [-2, 1, -2]]/3$, $g_2 = -[[1, -2, -2], [-2, 1, -2], [-2, -2, 1]]/3$, and $g_3 = -[[1, 0, 0], [0, 0, 1], [0, 1, 0]]$. Note that $\langle \Psi \rangle$ in the $\mathbf{3}'$ IR is $(0, 0, 0)$ for S_4 but $(1, 1, 1)_\perp$ for $\bar{S}_4$. It is this difference that in principle allows $\bar{S}_4$ to accommodate non-zero θ_{13} , though the discussion in the next section shows that this turns out to be impossible.

dr		S_3	—	—	S_3	A_4	$S_4, \bar{S}_4$
		1	1'	1''	2	3	3'
S_4	F_1	1	1	—	$\text{diag}(\omega, \omega^2)$	$\text{diag}(1, \omega, \omega^2)$	$\text{diag}(1, \omega, \omega^2)$
	G_2	1	1	—	$\text{diag}(1, 1)$	g_2	g_2
	G_3	1	-1	—	σ_1	$-g_3$	g_3
	$\langle \Phi \rangle$	1	1	—	$(0, 0)$	$(1, 0, 0)$	$(1, 0, 0)$
	$\langle \Psi \rangle$	1	0	—	$(1, 1)$	$(1, 1, 1)$	$(0, 0, 0)$
A_4	F_1	1	ω	ω^2	—	$\text{diag}(1, \omega, \omega^2)$	—
	G_2	1	1	1	—	g_2	—
	$\langle \Phi \rangle$	1	0	0	—	$(1, 0, 0)$	—
	$\langle \Psi \rangle$	1	1	1	—	$(1, 1, 1)$	—
S_3	F_1	1	1	—	$\text{diag}(\omega, \omega^2)$	—	—
	G_3	1	-1	—	σ_1	—	—
	$\langle \Phi \rangle$	1	1	—	$(0, 0)$	—	—
	$\langle \Psi \rangle$	1	0	—	$(1, 1)$	—	—
$\bar{S}_4$	F_1	1	1	—	$\text{diag}(\omega, \omega^2)$	$\text{diag}(1, \omega, \omega^2)$	$\text{diag}(1, \omega, \omega^2)$
	G_1	1	-1	—	σ_1	$-g_1$	g_1
	$\langle \Phi \rangle$	1	1	—	$(0, 0)$	$(1, 0, 0)$	$(1, 0, 0)$
	$\langle \Psi \rangle$	1	0	—	$(1, 1)$	$(1, 1, 1)$	$(1, 1, 1)_\perp$

Table 1. Vacuum alignments $\langle \Phi \rangle$ and $\langle \Psi \rangle$ of the horizontal symmetry groups $S_4, A_4, S_3, \bar{S}_4$ for leptons. See the text for an explanation of the symbols.

IV. LOW ENERGY CONTENT

As mentioned in the Introduction, the low-energy content (masses, mixing angles, and phases) of any dynamical theory is already contained in the LH effective mass matrices $\bar{M}_i$ ($i = u, d, e, \nu$), which can be read off from the LH effective Hamiltonian $\bar{H}$. In this section we shall discuss the structure of $\bar{H}$ for every symmetry group $\mathcal{G}$ discussed in the previous section.

The effective Hamiltonian can be written symbolically as

$$\bar{H} = \sum_A \left(\lambda_A e_L^\dagger e_L \Phi^A + \mu_A \nu_L^T \nu_L \Psi^A \right), \quad (4)$$

with all couplings understood to be $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant. The LH charged-lepton fields are denoted by e_L , and the LH neutrino fields are denoted by ν_L . They belong to the defining representations $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{3}', \mathbf{3}, (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}), \mathbf{3}'$, respectively for the groups $\mathcal{G} = S_4, A_4, S_3, \bar{S}_4$ (see Table 1). Only IRs A contained in the Clebsch-Gordan (CG) series $\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{r}$ appear in the sum in (4). The effective mass matrices $\bar{M}_e$ and $\bar{M}_\nu$ can be read off from (4) using the Higgs alignments listed in Table 1. Since $\bar{M}_e = \bar{M}_e^\dagger$ and $\bar{M}_\nu = \bar{M}_\nu^T$, IR A that leads to an anti-symmetric contribution to $\bar{M}_\nu$ should be dropped. Moreover, the parameters λ_A have to be real though μ_A may be complex.

The construction of (4) is schematically shown in Table 2. The first and second rows together specify the defining representation $\mathbf{r}$ of the various groups, and the remaining rows indicate how the CG series $\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{r}$ pans out. $-$ denotes an IR that is not present in that group, and $\times$ denotes an IR that does not appear in the CG series $\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{r}$. A ‘0’ indicates a term in which the expectation value $\langle \Phi \rangle$ or $\langle \Psi \rangle$ vanishes so the corresponding coupling constant does not appear as a parameter. Each entry in S_3 is shown as a 2×2 matrix, indicating the Clebsch-Gordan series for $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1} \times \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1} \times \mathbf{2} \\ \mathbf{2} \times \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{2} \times \mathbf{2} \end{pmatrix}$.

The directions of the Higgs expectation values are given in Table 1, and their magnitudes can be absorbed into the Yukawa coupling constants λ_A or μ_A , hence the number of free parameters is just the number of Yukawa coupling constants, each of which is represented by a black dot, with the total number listed in the last column. An open circle indicates an antisymmetric contribution to $\bar{M}_\nu$ that has been dropped. In the case of S_3 , the open circle actually represents the antisymmetric combination of $\mathbf{1} \times \mathbf{2}$ and $\mathbf{2} \times \mathbf{1}$. As mentioned above, the parameters in the Φ rows have to be real but the parameters in the Ψ rows may be complex.

	r	S_3	$-$	$-$	S_3	A_4	$S_4, \bar{S}_4$		
	A	1	1'	1''	2	3	3'	#	
S_4	Φ	$\bullet$	$\times$	$-$	0	$\bullet$	$\bullet$	3	
	Ψ	$\bullet$	$\times$	$-$	$\bullet$	$\bullet$	0	3	
A_4	Φ	$\bullet$	0	0	$-$	$\bullet\bullet$	$-$	3	
	Ψ	$\bullet$	$\bullet$	$\bullet$	$-$	$\bullet\circ$	$-$	4	
S_3	Φ	$\bullet$	$\times$	$\times$	$\times$	0	$-$	$-$	3
		$\times$	$\bullet$	$\times$	$\bullet$	0	0	$-$	$-$
	Ψ	$\bullet$	$\times$	$\times$	$\times$	$\bullet$	$-$	$-$	4
		$\times$	$\bullet$	$\times$	0	$\circ$	$\bullet$	$-$	$-$
$\bar{S}_4$	Φ	$\bullet$	$\times$	$-$	0	$\bullet$	$\bullet$	3	
	Ψ	$\bullet$	$\times$	$-$	$\bullet$	$\bullet$	$\circ$	3	

Table 2. Coupling scheme for $\bar{H}$ in (4), with the total number of independent free parameters listed in the last column. See the text before the table for an explanation of the symbols.

We want to find out whether mass matrices so obtained contain less, just enough, or more parameters than necessary to fit the low-energy data. In the charged-lepton sector, every Φ row of Table 2 contains exactly three real parameters to fill the three entries of the diagonal mass matrix $\bar{M}_e$, which is just enough to fit the three charged-lepton masses no matter what $\mathcal{G}$ is.

The neutrino sector is more complicated. The three neutrino masses combining with the two Majorana phases form three complex masses, albeit with an arbitrary overall phase. As to mixing, since S_4 automatically gives rise to the tri-bimaximal matrix, no additional parameter is required to fix the mixing, so the total number of complex parameters needed to fit the low energy data is 3, exactly what the effective Hamiltonian provides. In the other three cases, where only one column of the tri-bimaximal matrix is automatically obtained, we need one additional complex parameter to fully specify the mixing matrix [7]. Thus in those three cases the total number of complex parameters needed to fit the low energy data is 4. From Table 2, we see that is precisely what we have for A_4 and S_3 , but we are one short in $\bar{S}_4$. As explained below, it turns out in this case that $\theta_{13} = 0$ automatically, so all the mixings are determined, and 3 is just the right number of parameters to fit the complex neutrino masses.

Let us now look at the resulting neutrino mass matrices to understand what really happens. For A_4 , explicit calculation shows that

$$\bar{M}_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\mu}_1 + 2\bar{\mu}_3 & \bar{\mu}_{1''} - \bar{\mu}_3 & \bar{\mu}_{1'} - \bar{\mu}_3 \\ \bar{\mu}_{1''} - \bar{\mu}_3 & \bar{\mu}_{1'} + 2\bar{\mu}_3 & \bar{\mu}_1 - \bar{\mu}_3 \\ \bar{\mu}_{1'} - \bar{\mu}_3 & \bar{\mu}_1 - \bar{\mu}_3 & \bar{\mu}_{1''} + 2\bar{\mu}_3 \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

where $\bar{\mu}_1 = \mu_1/\sqrt{3}$, $\bar{\mu}_{1'} = \mu_{1'}/\sqrt{3}$, $\bar{\mu}_{1''} = \mu_{1''}/\sqrt{3}$, $\bar{\mu}_3 = \mu_3/\sqrt{6}$. This matrix is magic [8], whose row and column sums all equal to $\bar{\mu}_1 + \bar{\mu}_{1'} + \bar{\mu}_{1''}$, hence the mixing matrix computed from it is trimaximal. It has four complex parameters, which can be used to fit the three complex neutrino masses and the remaining mixing parameter. In particular, if $\bar{\mu}_{1'} = \bar{\mu}_{1''} \doteq \bar{\mu}_2$, then the mass matrix is also 2-3 symmetric [9], and the corresponding mixing is bimaximal. The mass matrix in that case coincides with the mass matrix of S_4 , with the **2** IR of S_4 decomposing into $(\mathbf{1}', \mathbf{1}'')$ in A_4 , and the corresponding mixing matrix tri-bimaximal. In summary, the A_4 effective Hamiltonian $\bar{H}$ contains one more complex parameter than S_4 , and that can be used to accommodate a non-vanishing reactor angle θ_{13} and a CP phase. If that parameter is chosen so that the reactor angle vanishes, then the A_4 symmetry is accidentally enlarged to an S_4 symmetry.

The neutrino mass matrix for S_3 is

$$\bar{M}_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \mu_2 \\ \mu_2 & \bar{\mu}_2 & \bar{\mu}_1 \\ \mu_2 & \bar{\mu}_1 & \bar{\mu}_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

where μ_1 is the Yukawa coupling of $\mathbf{1} \times \mathbf{1}$ to $A = 1$, and $\bar{\mu}_1$ is the Yukawa coupling of $\mathbf{2} \times \mathbf{2}$ to $A = 1$ divided by $\sqrt{2}$. Similarly, μ_2 and $\bar{\mu}_2$ are the coupling constants for $A = 2$ coming from $\mathbf{1} \times \mathbf{2}$ and $\mathbf{2} \times \mathbf{2}$ respectively. This mass matrix is 2-3 symmetric, befitting a bimaximal mixing appropriate to S_3 . It has four adjustable complex parameters that can be used to fit the three complex neutrino masses and the remaining complex mixing parameter. In particular, if $\mu_1 + \mu_2 = \bar{\mu}_1 + \bar{\mu}_2$, the mass matrix becomes magic, the mixing becomes tri-bimaximal, and S_3 attains the enlarged accidental symmetry S_4 .

Finally let us consider $\bar{S}_4$. It differs from S_4 in that $\langle \Psi \rangle$ for $\mathbf{3}'$ does not have to vanish (see the last row of Table 1). However, since the $\mathbf{3}' \times \mathbf{3}' \rightarrow \mathbf{3}'$ coupling is antisymmetric on the left, it cannot contribute to $\bar{M}_\nu$, so the mass matrices in $\bar{S}_4$ are identical to the mass matrices in S_4 . In other words, it automatically predicts a zero reactor angle θ_{13} , which is why only 3 complex parameters are enough to fit all the low energy data.

By using less parameters than those listed in the last column of Table 2, one can construct models with ‘predictions’ relating some of the low-energy quantities, *e.g.*, mixing angles in terms of mass ratios. It should also be noted that local dynamical models may contain more parameters than those listed in Table 2, but if that is the case, some of them must combine in their corresponding LH effective Hamiltonian.

In conclusion, if tri-bimaximal neutrino mixing is exactly true, then S_4 and $\bar{S}_4$ are the most economical symmetry group because it makes the most predications and requires the smallest number of parameters to fit the remaining data. On the other hand, if $\theta_{13} \neq 0$, then only A_4 among these four could be the correct symmetry group, assuming of course that trimaximal mixing still remains valid with better data. If neither trimaximal nor bimaximal mixing is valid in the face of better data, then these four groups can only lead to an approximate fitting in tree order. Which of the four gives a better approximation then depends on the data and the results of higher-order calculations.

V. QUARK MIXING

Quark mixing is very different from neutrino mixing because it is small. In principle the method reviewed in Sec. 2 can be used to find its horizontal symmetry group $\mathcal{G}$, but in practice, it is difficult to make $\mathcal{G}$ a finite group because there is no known parameterization in this sector equivalent to the tri-bimaximal matrix. For $\mathcal{G}$ to be a finite group, there must be an integer n so that $g^n = 1$ for every $g \in G$. If this property is true for some matrix g , it can no longer be true by suitably altering the matrix elements a little bit within their experimental error. This is similar to saying that $22/7$ is a rational number but π is not, although the former is an approximation to the latter. If a finite group exists, it is likely that this group belongs to a series with an adjustable parameter so that the small Cabibbo angle can be accommodated. These would suggest finite groups like the dihedral groups D_m , or the $SU(3)$ finite subgroups $\Delta(3m^2)$ and $\Delta(6m^2)$. Indeed D_7 and D_{14} have been proposed as candidates [1, 10].

However, if we want quarks and leptons to be united, like in a grand unified theory, then they should have the same horizontal symmetry group $\mathcal{G}$. There are two ways to accommodate that. One is to find a large group containing both, such as $SU(3)$, which at an early stage breaks down to the individual symmetry groups in the quark and the

lepton sectors. Such a construction would have to be completely dynamical and the present approach can say very little about it. The other is to assume the leptonic symmetry group, like S_4 , A_4 , or S_3 , to be also the symmetry group of the quarks, with the same set of Higgs and the same vacuum alignments. Many dynamical models have been constructed along these lines. In that case, quarks do not mix in the tree level, so all their mixing must come from loop corrections. One way to do that is to assign both the LH and the RH fermions to the defining 3-dimensional representation, and introduce two sets of Higgs, ϕ and ψ , so that ϕ have the same vacuum alignments as Φ , and ψ has the same vacuum alignments as Ψ . The Higgs ϕ would couple the LH fermions to the RH fermions to produce the diagonal Dirac mass matrices M_i ($i = u, d, e, \nu$), and ψ would couple only to the heavy Majorana neutrinos to produce the mass matrix M_N . This would guarantee $\bar{M}_i = M_i^\dagger M_i$ to be diagonal, and the neutrino effective mass matrix $\bar{M}_\nu = M_\nu^T M_N^{-1} M_\nu$ to give rise to a neutrino mixing appropriate to $\mathcal{G}$. How realistic schemes like that are depend on how successful are the high-order corrections. These corrections can be implemented by higher-dimensional terms, at the expense of introducing new parameters, but it would be nice if they could be computed in a renormalizable theory.

I thank Christoph Luhn for helpful discussions and comments.

-
- [1] C.S. Lam, Phys. Lett. B656 (2007) 193, arXiv:0708.3665; Int. J. Mod. Phys. A23 (2008) 3371, arXiv:0711.3795; Phys. Rev. Lett. 101 (2008) 121602, arXiv:0804.2622; Phys. Rev. D78 (2008)073015, arXiv:0809.1185.
 - [2] P.F. Harrison, D.H. Perkins, and W.G. Scott, Phys. Lett. B458, (1999) 79, hep-ph/9904297; Phys. Lett. B530, (2002) 167, hep-ph/0202074.
 - [3] W. Grimus, L. Lavoura, and P.O. Ludl, arXiv:0906.2689.
 - [4] G. Altarelli, F. Feruglio, and L. Merlo, JHEP 0905 (2009) 020, arXiv:0903.1940; G. Altarelli, arXiv:0905.2350.
 - [5] S.F. King and C. Luhn, arXiv:0905.1686.
 - [6] J.D. Bjorken, P.F. Harrison, and W.F. Scott, Phys. Rev. D74 (2006) 073012, hep-ph/0511201; P.F. Harrison, and W.F. Scott, Phys. Lett. B535 (2002) 163, hep-ph/0203209; arXiv:0906.2732.

- [7] C.S. Lam, Phys. Rev. D74 (2006) 113004, hep-ph/0611017.
- [8] P.F. Harrison and W.G. Scott, Phys. Lett. B594 (2004) 324, hep-ph/0403278; R. Friedberg and T.D. Lee, hep-ph/0606071; C.S. Lam, Phys. Lett. B640 (2006) 260, hep-ph/0606220.
- [9] T. Fukuyama and H. Nishiura, in Proceeding of 1997 Shizuoka Workshop on Masses and Mixings of Quarks and Leptons, hep-ph/9702253; R.N. Mohapatra and S. Nussinov, Phys. Lett. B441 (1998) 299, hep-ph/9808301; Phys. Rev. D60 (1999) 013002, hep-ph/9809415; C.S. Lam, Phys. Lett. B507 (2001) 214, hep-ph/0104116; W. Grimus and L. Lavoura, Phys. Lett. JHEP 0107 (2001) 045, hep-ph/0105212.
- [10] A. Blum, C. Hagedorn, and A. Hohenegger, JHEP 0803 (2008) 070, arXiv:0710.5061.